

Tiahrt  
Toomey  
Traffant  
Turner  
Upton  
Vitter  
Walden

Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller

Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—196

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baird  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Forbes  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt

## NOT VOTING—9

Camp  
Coburn  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)

Jefferson  
Linder  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)

□ 1718

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. RAHALL, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1180. An act to amend the Social Security Act to expand the availability of health care coverage for working individuals with disabilities, to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide such individuals with meaningful opportunities to work, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1180) "An Act to amend the Social Security Act to expand the availability of health care coverage for working individuals with disabilities, to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide such individuals with meaningful opportunities to work, and for other purposes" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROTH, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. MOYNIHAN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2466, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 337, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 20, 1999, at page H10517.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2466, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for the next several minutes, I wish all the Members would

forget about partisan politics, forget about some of the personal things that they might not totally agree with and think what is good for the people of the United States of America. Two hundred seventy million people are depending on us to ensure that they have a park to visit, to ensure that when they go to a national forest they will be safe, that the facilities will be good, to ensure when a group of children go out in a bus to a fish and wildlife refuge to learn about the ecology of this Nation that there will be somebody there to tell about it, to ensure when they visit the Smithsonian, it will be open, that it will be well cared for, that the people will be there to serve them.

I could go through a whole list of things. Millions of Americans will go to our facilities over the next 12 months, and the quality of their experience is being decided here. Likewise, think about the generations that are here and yet to come, because the legacy we leave them in terms of our national lands is being decided not by them but by us. Let us forget partisanship for a minute and let us say, what kind of a legacy do we want to leave for future generations as well as for those of today's world. What kind of opportunities do we want them to have.

For example, in this bill will be funds to do long distance learning through the Smithsonian, the National Gallery of Art, the Kennedy Center, an opportunity to tell the story of these marvelous institutions to all the young people of America, many of whom cannot travel to Washington. We have a responsibility to them that should transcend our own personal prejudices on this day. We did that on this bill earlier this year, by overwhelming majorities on both sides. We supported this bill. Sure there have been a few changes, some probably better, a little more money being spent, but the basic bill is the same. The basic bill provides the kind of services that the American people expect us to deliver. That is why we are sent here. And we have an opportunity today to reaffirm that judgment that we made several months ago.

To vote yes, we are voting for a lot of positive environmental things. We are voting to clean up the streams of America through the abandoned mine law. We have increased it. We are voting to spend \$77 million more dollars on the parks as well as allow them to keep the \$100 plus million that they earn with the fee program. We are voting to diminish vandalism because through the fee program we have discovered that vandalism in the public facilities, the public lands, is reduced. We have in our hands today 30 percent of the land in this Nation, and we are responsible, each of us are responsible with our vote as to how we treat this wonderful, wonderful asset. It is a legacy that has been provided for us.

Just think about New York City. If Frederick Olmstead had not had the vision to save 800 acres called Central Park, there would not be this oasis of beauty in that city. Think what that means to the 10 or 11 million people. Each of us today are going to vote, have an opportunity to do the same, to preserve these facilities. As we become more urbanized, as our cities become more heavily populated, it becomes even more important that we preserve these open spaces.

This bill provides funds to purchase 95,000 acres called the Baca Ranch. I have been there. You walk out in the meadows and there are 6,000 elk grazing. They are not there with a halter around them tied to the ground. They are there as free spirits, free standing, because that is the great natural legacy of their existence. We have a chance to preserve that opportunity.

We have an opportunity here to make good on a promise this body made several years ago. We said to coal miners who suffered with black lung, who suffered with all kinds of physical problems, we are going to help you, because this is a compassionate Nation, we care about people. So we passed a law to give these people some help. Today, we are providing some additional funds. The fund is depleted. Are we going to say to these people, "Sorry, we made a promise but we're not going to keep it"?

Those are just a few items that are embodied in this bill. Sure, I know we can talk about the riders. But these are important. It is important to the people that live along the shorelines of this Nation, be it California or Florida or North Carolina, that their offshore be preserved. That is a rider. It says there shall be no drilling offshore. It is important that there not be more patents issued to give away our public lands. That is in this bill. It is called a rider.

We have a couple of others in here. They are much less severe than was the case in the language that was in the Senate, but in the process of a compromise that represents this report today, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and myself, members from both sides of the aisle, fought to mitigate those riders, to soften them but be fair to the people. We cannot say to a rancher that for 50 years he and his family have been running cattle that just suddenly we are going to cut you off tomorrow. That is not fair. But we do say, once we have done an EIS, if you do not meet the standards, you are going to lose your permit. And we give the Secretary of Interior the right to make that decision.

We do not have a lot of time. I am going to stop here. We have others that want to speak. Just examine your conscience and say, What do I want my legacy to be? What do I want my vote to represent? Do I want it to represent

enhancing, preserving, taking care of these great assets that are our legacies from other generations that served in this body. These 378 national parks just did not happen. They happened because people had vision, such as Teddy Roosevelt and many others.

□ 1730

Today, we are shaping the vision that others who serve here in years that follow us will say, gee, they really cared about the people of this Nation, they cared about preserving their crown jewels, the parks, they cared about preserving their forests for recreation. That is the challenge that we have to meet when we put the card in the slot this afternoon.

Today, as we take up the conference report making appropriations for Interior and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2000, you have the opportunity to voice your commitment to America's priceless natural and cultural resources. We can leave our children and future generations no more valuable legacy than our national parks, wildlife refuges, forests and wilderness areas, and our rich cultural heritage which defines who we are as a people and nation.

I urge you to vote in favor of this conference report. Don't let politics or a dedication to fiscal austerity cause you to overlook all the many very positive things that can be achieved through this bill. The American people expect you to be the guardians of their most highly prized natural and cultural resources. Don't let them down.

Getting to this point has been challenging, with many hurdles to overcome. The President sent the Congress a budget request for fiscal year 2000 that was balanced, only because it relied on budget gimmicks, increased taxes and new user fees. In contrast, this conference agreement sought to deal with real needs and important issues directly, fairly and in a way that best serves the public. This year's appropriation amount is \$14.5 billion, a very modest increase of 1½ percent over last year's \$14.3 billion. This is a very small price to pay to protect and preserve the nation's natural and cultural resources.

The House and Senate bills contained numerous differences, large and small, reflecting the concerns and priorities of the members of the two chambers. Reconciling these differences provoked spirited debate on all sides of the issues. Conferees argued their positions with reason and passion. But in the end, everyone's willingness to listen and seek common ground prevailed over our differences.

As a result, I am pleased to report that the conference report you have before you effectively addresses the priorities Americans care most about. These include \$1.4 billion for National Park Service operations to enhance visitors' safety and their enjoyment of America's great natural wonders; \$40 million to purchase the Baca Ranch in New Mexico, preserving a unique expanse of the Old West; over \$500 million for the Smithsonian Institution and the National Gallery of Art so that visitors from across America and the world can enjoy the thousands of marvels of science, history, technology and the animal kingdom and the glo-

rious works of art on display here; \$68 million for the United Mine Workers of America Combined Benefit Fund, which is nearly depleted because of several recent court decisions, to ensure that elderly mine workers and their dependents continue to receive health care. I urge the authorizing committees to take up this issue and develop a long-term solution to this problem.

We have continued an important commitment I have made to improve management of the agencies funded by this bill. This year we have worked with the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) in examining the management of both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We are instructing these agencies to take steps to implement NAPA's recommendations for more effective and efficient management.

I wish to express my appreciation to Senator GORTON and his subcommittee members for their willingness to seek common ground to allow us to bridge significant differences in our respective bills. They worked diligently with us to achieve compromises on three key legislative provisions.

First, regarding mill sites, the conference report does not prohibit the Department of the Interior from enforcing the Solicitor's decision that establishes a limit of one mill site per mining claim, as the Senate had proposed. Interior may enforce the limitation on new claims, but exceptions are made for existing mining plans of operation (already agreed to by Secretary Babbitt), plans of operation submitted prior to May 21, 1999, and patent applications grandfathered pursuant to the current patent application moratorium in place since fiscal year 1995.

Second, the Senate included a provision which would have extended all expiring Bureau of Land Management grazing permits based on existing terms and conditions. The conference agreement clearly states that the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to alter, modify or reject permit renewals following completion of all required environmental analyses is not altered. The agreement also includes additional funding to accelerate the processing of these permits.

Third, the Senate had included a provision prohibiting the Minerals Management Service from implementing a new rule on oil valuation through fiscal year 2000. The conference agreement prohibit the rule from being implemented for a period not to exceed 6 months, or until the Comptroller General reviews the proposed regulation and issues a report. There is no prohibition on implementation following the release of the report.

In summary, this conference report is not about politics and partisanship. This report reflects our commitments to protecting America's most valuable natural resources for future generations and promoting culture, science and history for the benefit of communities, large and small, throughout this country. Passage of this report means meeting our responsibilities to American Indians and Alaska Natives and continuing essential research to increase energy efficiency and maintain a clean, healthy environment. Again, as strongly as I possibly can, I urge you to vote for its passage.

There are three corrections that need to be made to the conference report. The number

for the Historic Preservation Fund in the National Park Service should be \$75,212,000, the number of Forest Service land acquisition should be \$79,575,000 and in section 310, "1999" should read "2000."

We will take the necessary steps to ensure these corrections are made.

Also, in the statement of the managers, the first sentence under the Historic Preservation Fund in the National Park Service should read, "The conference agreement provides \$75,212,000 for the Historic preservation fund instead of \$46,712,000 as proposed by the

House and \$42,412,000 as proposed by the Senate."

At this point Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a table detailing the various accounts in the bill.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)**  
**(Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>						
<b>Bureau of Land Management</b>						
Management of lands and resources .....	612,511	641,100	631,068	634,321	644,218	+ 31,707
Wildland fire management .....	286,895	305,850	292,399	283,805	292,282	+ 5,387
Central hazardous materials fund .....	10,000	11,350	10,000	10,000	10,000	.....
Construction .....	10,997	8,350	11,100	12,418	11,425	+ 428
Payments in lieu of taxes .....	125,000	125,000	145,000	135,000	135,000	+ 10,000
Land acquisition .....	14,600	48,900	15,000	17,400	15,500	+ 900
Oregon and California grant lands .....	97,037	101,850	99,225	99,225	99,225	+ 2,188
Range improvements (indefinite) .....	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	.....
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite) .....	8,055	8,800	8,800	8,800	8,800	+ 745
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite) .....	8,800	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700	-1,100
<b>Total, Bureau of Land Management .....</b>	<b>1,183,895</b>	<b>1,268,700</b>	<b>1,230,292</b>	<b>1,218,669</b>	<b>1,234,150</b>	<b>+ 50,255</b>
<b>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</b>						
Resource management .....	661,136	724,000	710,700	684,569	716,046	+ 54,910
Construction .....	50,453	43,569	43,933	40,434	54,583	+ 4,130
Emergency appropriations .....	37,612	.....	.....	.....	.....	-37,612
Land acquisition .....	48,024	73,632	42,000	56,444	50,513	+ 2,489
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund .....	14,000	80,000	15,000	21,480	16,000	+ 2,000
National wildlife refuge fund .....	10,779	10,000	10,779	10,000	10,779	.....
North American wetlands conservation fund .....	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	.....
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund .....	800	800	800	800	800	.....
Multinational species conservation fund .....	2,000	3,000	2,000	2,400	2,400	+ 400
Commercial salmon fishery capacity reduction .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,000	+ 5,000
<b>Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service .....</b>	<b>839,804</b>	<b>950,001</b>	<b>840,212</b>	<b>831,127</b>	<b>871,121</b>	<b>+ 31,317</b>
<b>National Park Service</b>						
Operation of the national park system .....	1,285,604	1,389,627	1,387,307	1,355,176	1,365,059	+ 79,455
Emergency appropriations .....	2,320	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,320
National recreation and preservation .....	46,225	48,336	49,449	51,451	53,899	+ 7,674
Historic preservation fund .....	72,412	80,512	46,712	42,412	75,212	+ 2,800
Construction .....	226,058	194,000	169,856	223,153	224,493	-1,565
Emergency appropriations .....	13,680	.....	.....	.....	.....	-13,680
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority) .....	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	-30,000	.....
Land acquisition and state assistance .....	147,925	172,468	132,000	107,725	120,700	-27,225
Conservation grants and planning assistance .....	.....	200,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Urban park and recreation fund .....	.....	4,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
<b>Total, National Park Service (net) .....</b>	<b>1,764,224</b>	<b>2,058,943</b>	<b>1,755,324</b>	<b>1,749,917</b>	<b>1,809,363</b>	<b>+ 45,139</b>
<b>United States Geological Survey</b>						
Surveys, investigations, and research .....	797,896	838,485	820,444	813,093	823,833	+ 25,937
Emergency appropriations .....	1,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,000
<b>Minerals Management Service</b>						
Royalty and offshore minerals management .....	217,902	234,082	234,082	234,682	234,682	+ 16,780
Additions to receipts .....	-100,000	-124,000	-124,000	-124,000	-124,000	-24,000
Oil spill research .....	6,118	6,118	6,118	6,118	6,118	.....
<b>Total, Minerals Management Service .....</b>	<b>124,020</b>	<b>116,200</b>	<b>116,200</b>	<b>116,800</b>	<b>116,800</b>	<b>-7,220</b>
<b>Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement</b>						
Regulation and technology .....	93,078	94,391	95,693	95,891	95,891	+ 2,813
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite) .....	275	275	275	275	275	.....
<b>Subtotal .....</b>	<b>93,353</b>	<b>94,666</b>	<b>95,968</b>	<b>96,166</b>	<b>96,166</b>	<b>+ 2,813</b>
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund) .....	185,416	211,158	196,458	185,658	191,208	+ 5,792
<b>Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement .....</b>	<b>278,769</b>	<b>305,824</b>	<b>292,426</b>	<b>281,824</b>	<b>287,374</b>	<b>+ 8,605</b>
<b>Bureau of Indian Affairs</b>						
Operation of Indian programs .....	1,584,124	1,694,387	1,631,050	1,633,296	1,637,444	+ 53,320
Construction .....	123,421	174,258	126,023	146,884	146,884	+ 23,463
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians .....	28,882	28,401	25,901	27,131	27,256	-1,626
Indian guaranteed loan program account .....	5,001	5,008	5,008	5,004	5,008	+ 7
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	.....
Indian land consolidation pilot .....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,000
<b>Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs .....</b>	<b>1,746,428</b>	<b>1,902,054</b>	<b>1,787,982</b>	<b>1,812,315</b>	<b>1,816,592</b>	<b>+ 70,164</b>

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)— continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Departmental Offices</b>						
<b>Insular Affairs:</b>						
Assistance to Territories.....	38,455	40,355	34,600	39,605	39,451	+ 996
Northern Marianas Islands Covenant .....	27,720	27,720	27,720	27,720	27,720	
Subtotal, Assistance to Territories .....	66,175	68,075	62,320	67,325	67,171	+ 996
Compact of Free Association .....	8,930	8,545	8,545	8,545	8,545	-385
Mandatory payments.....	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	
Subtotal, Compact of Free Association.....	20,930	20,545	20,545	20,545	20,545	-385
Total, Insular Affairs .....	87,105	88,620	82,865	87,870	87,716	+ 611
Departmental management .....	84,686	63,064	62,864	62,203	62,864	-1,822
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations) .....	80,347					-80,347
Office of the Solicitor .....	36,784	41,500	36,784	36,784	40,196	+ 3,412
Office of Inspector General.....	25,486	27,614	26,086	26,614	26,086	+ 600
Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians .....	61,299	90,025	90,025	73,836	90,025	+ 28,726
Indian land consolidation pilot.....		10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	+ 5,000
Natural resource damage assessment fund .....	4,492	7,900	5,400	4,621	5,400	+ 908
Management of Federal lands for subsistence uses .....	8,000					-8,000
Glacier Bay fishing (emergency appropriations) .....	26,000					-26,000
Total, Departmental Offices .....	394,199	328,723	309,024	296,928	317,287	-76,912
<b>Total, title I, Department of the Interior:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	7,130,235	7,768,930	7,151,904	7,120,673	7,276,520	+ 146,285
Appropriations .....	(6,999,276)	(7,798,930)	(7,181,904)	(7,150,673)	(7,306,520)	(+ 307,244)
Emergency appropriations .....	(160,959)					(-160,959)
Rescissions .....	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	
<b>TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>						
<b>Forest Service</b>						
Forest and rangeland research .....	197,444	234,644	204,373	187,444	202,700	+ 5,256
State and private forestry.....	170,722	252,422	181,464	190,793	187,534	+ 16,812
National forest system .....	1,298,570	1,357,178	1,254,434	1,239,051	1,251,504	-47,066
Wildland fire management .....	560,176	560,730	561,354	560,980	561,354	+ 1,178
Emergency appropriations .....	102,000	90,000		90,000	90,000	-12,000
Reconstruction and maintenance .....	297,352	295,000	396,602	362,095	398,927	+ 101,575
Emergency appropriations .....	5,611					-5,611
Land acquisition .....	117,918	118,000	1,000	36,370	79,575	-38,343
Acquisition of lands for national forests special acts .....	1,069	1,069	1,069	1,069	1,069	
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite) .....	210	210	210	210	210	
Range betterment fund (indefinite) .....	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research .....	92	92	92	92	92	
Southeast Alaska economic disaster fund .....					22,000	+ 22,000
Management of Federal lands for subsistence uses .....	3,000					-3,000
Total, Forest Service .....	2,757,464	2,912,645	2,603,898	2,671,404	2,798,265	+ 40,801
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</b>						
<b>Clean coal technology:</b>						
Deferral .....	-40,000	-256,000	-256,000	-156,000	-156,000	-116,000
Fossil energy research and development.....	384,056	340,000	256,292	366,975	386,025	+ 1,969
Biomass energy development (by transfer) .....		(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	(+ 24,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite).....	-1,300	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	+ 300
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves .....	14,000					-14,000
Elk Hills school lands fund .....	36,000	36,000	36,000			-36,000
Energy conservation.....	691,701	812,515	706,822	659,817	664,242	-27,459
Biomass energy development (by transfer) .....		(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(+ 25,000)
Economic regulation .....	1,801	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	+ 199
Strategic petroleum reserve.....	160,120	159,000	146,000	159,000	159,000	-1,120
SPR petroleum account .....		5,000				
Energy Information Administration.....	70,500	72,644	72,644	70,500	72,644	+ 2,144
Total, Department of Energy:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	1,316,878	1,170,159	962,758	1,101,292	1,126,911	-189,967
Appropriations .....	(1,356,878)	(1,426,159)	(1,218,758)	(1,257,292)	(1,282,911)	(-73,967)
Deferral .....	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-256,000)	(-156,000)	(-156,000)	(-116,000)
(By transfer) .....		(49,000)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(+ 49,000)

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)— continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</b>						
<b>Indian Health Service</b>						
Indian health services .....	1,950,322	2,094,922	2,085,407	2,138,001	2,053,967	+103,645
Indian health facilities .....	291,965	317,465	312,478	189,252	318,580	+26,615
<b>Total, Indian Health Service .....</b>	<b>2,242,287</b>	<b>2,412,387</b>	<b>2,397,885</b>	<b>2,327,253</b>	<b>2,372,547</b>	<b>+130,260</b>
<b>OTHER RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
<b>Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	13,000	14,000	13,400	8,000	8,000	-5,000
<b>Institute of American Indian and Alaska         Native Culture and Arts Development</b>						
Payment to the Institute .....	4,250	4,250		4,250	2,125	-2,125
<b>Smithsonian Institution</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	347,154	380,501	371,501	367,062	372,901	+25,747
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park .....	4,400			4,400		-4,400
Repair and restoration of buildings .....	40,000	47,900	47,900	35,000	47,900	+7,900
Construction .....	16,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	+3,000
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations) .....	4,700					-4,700
<b>Total, Smithsonian Institution .....</b>	<b>412,254</b>	<b>447,401</b>	<b>438,401</b>	<b>425,462</b>	<b>439,801</b>	<b>+27,547</b>
<b>National Gallery of Art</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	57,938	61,438	61,538	61,438	61,538	+3,600
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings .....	6,311	6,311	6,311	6,311	6,311	
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations) .....	101					-101
<b>Total, National Gallery of Art .....</b>	<b>64,350</b>	<b>67,749</b>	<b>67,849</b>	<b>67,749</b>	<b>67,849</b>	<b>+3,499</b>
<b>John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts</b>						
Operations and maintenance .....	12,187	14,000	12,441	14,000	14,000	+1,813
Construction .....	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	
<b>Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts .....</b>	<b>32,187</b>	<b>34,000</b>	<b>32,441</b>	<b>34,000</b>	<b>34,000</b>	<b>+1,813</b>
<b>Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	5,840	6,040	7,040	6,040	6,790	+950
<b>National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities</b>						
<b>National Endowment for the Arts</b>						
Grants and administration .....	83,500	137,000	83,500	90,000	85,000	+1,500
Matching grants .....	14,500	13,000	14,500	13,000	13,000	-1,500
<b>Total, National Endowment for the Arts .....</b>	<b>98,000</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>98,000</b>	<b>103,000</b>	<b>98,000</b>	
<b>National Endowment for the Humanities</b>						
Grants and administration .....	96,800	129,800	96,800	101,000	101,000	+4,200
Matching grants .....	13,900	20,200	13,900	14,700	14,700	+800
<b>Total, National Endowment for the Humanities .....</b>	<b>110,700</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>110,700</b>	<b>115,700</b>	<b>115,700</b>	<b>+5,000</b>
<b>Institute of Museum and Library Services/         Office of Museum Services</b>						
Grants and administration .....	23,405	34,000	24,400	23,905	24,400	+995
<b>Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities .....</b>	<b>232,105</b>	<b>334,000</b>	<b>233,100</b>	<b>242,605</b>	<b>238,100</b>	<b>+5,995</b>
<b>Commission of Fine Arts</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	898	1,078	935	1,078	1,005	+107
<b>National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs</b>						
Grants .....	7,000	6,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	
<b>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	2,800	3,000	3,000	2,906	3,000	+200
<b>National Capital Planning Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	5,954	6,312	6,312	6,312	6,312	+358
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations) .....	381					-381

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466) — continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>United States Holocaust Memorial Council</b>						
Holocaust Memorial Council .....	32,107	33,786	33,286	33,286	33,286	+ 1,179
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations) .....	900					-900
Emergency appropriations .....	2,000					-2,000
<b>Total, United States Holocaust Memorial Council .....</b>	<b>35,007</b>	<b>33,786</b>	<b>33,286</b>	<b>33,286</b>	<b>33,286</b>	<b>-1,721</b>
<b>Presidio Trust</b>						
Presidio trust fund .....	34,913	44,400	44,400	44,400	44,400	+ 9,487
<b>Total, title II, related agencies:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	7,167,568	7,497,207	6,851,705	6,983,037	7,189,391	+21,823
Appropriations .....	(7,091,875)	(7,663,207)	(7,107,705)	(7,049,037)	(7,255,391)	(+ 163,516)
Emergency appropriations .....	(115,693)	(90,000)		(90,000)	(90,000)	(-25,693)
Deferral .....	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-256,000)	(-156,000)	(-156,000)	(-116,000)
(By transfer) .....		(49,000)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(+ 49,000)
<b>TITLE III</b>						
Across-the-board cut in Floor action .....			-69,000	-48,000		
<b>TITLE V</b>						
United Mine Workers of America combined benefit fund (emergency appropriations) .....					68,000	+ 68,000
<b>Grand total:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	14,297,803	15,266,137	13,934,609	14,055,710	14,533,911	+236,108
Appropriations .....	(14,091,151)	(15,462,137)	(14,220,609)	(14,151,710)	(14,561,911)	(+ 470,760)
Emergency appropriations .....	(276,652)	(90,000)		(90,000)	(158,000)	(-118,652)
Rescissions .....	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	(-30,000)	
Deferral .....	(-40,000)	(-256,000)	(-256,000)	(-156,000)	(-156,000)	(-116,000)
(By transfer) .....		(49,000)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(49,000)	(+ 49,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	(59,682)	
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>						
Bureau of Land Management .....	1,183,895	1,268,700	1,230,292	1,218,669	1,234,150	+ 50,255
United States Fish and Wildlife Service .....	839,804	950,001	840,212	831,127	871,121	+ 31,317
National Park Service .....	1,764,224	2,058,943	1,755,324	1,749,917	1,809,363	+ 45,139
United States Geological Survey .....	798,896	838,485	820,444	813,093	823,833	+24,937
Minerals Management Service .....	124,020	116,200	116,200	116,800	116,800	-7,220
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement .....	278,769	305,824	292,426	281,824	287,374	+ 8,605
Bureau of Indian Affairs .....	1,746,428	1,902,054	1,787,982	1,812,315	1,816,592	+70,164
Departmental Offices .....	394,199	328,723	309,024	296,928	317,287	-76,912
<b>Total, Title I - Department of the Interior .....</b>	<b>7,130,235</b>	<b>7,768,930</b>	<b>7,151,904</b>	<b>7,120,673</b>	<b>7,276,520</b>	<b>+ 146,285</b>
<b>TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
Forest Service .....	2,757,464	2,912,645	2,603,898	2,671,404	2,798,265	+ 40,801
Department of Energy .....	1,316,878	1,170,159	962,758	1,101,292	1,126,911	-189,967
Indian Health Service .....	2,242,287	2,412,387	2,397,885	2,327,253	2,372,547	+ 130,260
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation .....	13,000	14,000	13,400	8,000	8,000	-5,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts						
Development .....	4,250	4,250		4,250	2,125	-2,125
Smithsonian Institution .....	412,254	447,401	438,401	425,462	439,801	+27,547
National Gallery of Art .....	64,350	67,749	67,849	67,749	67,849	+ 3,499
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts .....	32,187	34,000	32,441	34,000	34,000	+ 1,813
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars .....	5,840	6,040	7,040	6,040	6,790	+950
National Endowment for the Arts .....	98,000	150,000	98,000	103,000	98,000	
National Endowment for the Humanities .....	110,700	150,000	110,700	115,700	115,700	+ 5,000
Institute of Museum and Library Services .....	23,405	34,000	24,400	23,905	24,400	+995
Commission of Fine Arts .....	898	1,078	935	1,078	1,005	+107
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs .....	7,000	6,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation .....	2,800	3,000	3,000	2,906	3,000	+200
National Capital Planning Commission .....	6,335	6,312	6,312	6,312	6,312	-23
Holocaust Memorial Council .....	35,007	33,786	33,286	33,286	33,286	-1,721
Presidio Trust .....	34,913	44,400	44,400	44,400	44,400	+ 9,487
<b>Total, Title II - Related Agencies .....</b>	<b>7,167,568</b>	<b>7,497,207</b>	<b>6,851,705</b>	<b>6,983,037</b>	<b>7,189,391</b>	<b>+21,823</b>
<b>TITLE III</b>						
Across-the-board cut in Floor action .....			-69,000	-48,000		

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2466)— continued  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE V						
United Mine Workers of America combined benefit fund (emergency appropriations) .....					68,000	+ 68,000
Grand total .....	14,297,803	15,266,137	13,934,609	14,055,710	14,533,911	+ 236,108



Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the conference report on the Fiscal Year 2000 Interior and related agencies appropriations bill. I will explain my reasons for this position in a moment, but first I want to state categorically that my opposition to this measure does not in any way impugn the job done by the chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). As chairman of the conference, he had the virtually impossible task of trying to bridge insurmountable differences of opinion between the Houses, the parties and the branches of Government, and I also want to at this time commend the staff of the subcommittee, Debbie Weatherly and the members of the majority staff, Del Davis, and the minority staff. These people have worked very hard under very difficult circumstances to bring this conference report, and they are highly professional people who work for the best interests of the House of Representatives.

In many ways the recommendations of the conferees on this measure represent improvements compared to the bill that passed the House in July. However, in other important ways, specifically the addition of three environmentally damaging legislative riders, this agreement is much worse than the House bill and will almost certainly be vetoed by the President. The inclusion of the riders is especially troublesome given the vote of the full House on the motion to instruct conferees.

Two hundred eighteen members of this House, a majority, voted to instruct conferees to support the Rahall amendment limiting the number and size of mill sites on public lands to support the Senate, the other body's position increasing funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities by \$5 million each and to reject the Senate's anti-environmental riders. Unfortunately the only part of the instruction that was followed was to agree with the Senate's funding increase for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Environmentalists and the administration have roundly criticized the Senate bill. While it may be true that the conference agreement has marginally improved some of the riders, the resulting provisions are still opposed by the administration and have no place in this appropriations bill. The provisions relating to mining mill sites, delaying hard rock mining regulation, delaying oil royalty evaluation regulations, and grazing should not have been accepted by the conference.

The conferees' decisions on funding for the National Endowment for the Arts is a major disappointment. Despite the fact that the conference agreement provides a total of 600 mil-

lion more for agencies and programs funded in the bill than the amount in the House-passed bill and despite the fact that the House had instructed its conferees to agree with the slightly higher funding levels for the NEH, the conference ended with no increase for the arts. Once again opponents of the NEA dredged up outdated information and outright misinformation. Once again the views of the ultra-conservative caucus representing a minority of one body have been allowed to override the wishes of a majority in both Houses.

Another feature of the bill that causes great concern is the inadequate funding provided for the administration's new Land Legacy program, one of the major initiatives of the 2000 budget. The administration proposal was to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund at the fully authorized level of 900 million, including roughly 800 million in the Interior appropriations bill.

The conference agreement, while improving on the 190 million included in the House bill, provides only about one-third, or 266 million, of the amounts requested. While the conference agreement is 600 million higher than the House bill, funding for the administration's top priority was only increased by 75 million. The recommendation of the conferees does not even match last year's level. It is 62 million less. And last year's bill was 500 million less in total than this year.

Two major parts of the President's Land Legacy initiative, the 200 million requested for conservation grants and planning assistance and the 66 million increase requested for the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund, did not receive any funding. Given the threat of development in and around so many of our parks, forests, refuges, and other public lands and given the strong support of acquiring and conserving these sensitive lands by a substantial majority of the American people, the failure of this bill to address these needs adequately is a serious flaw.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this conference report and avoid the imminent veto by the administration. Passing the conference report right now is futile if changes are not made.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio that I agree with him on the Park Service and on several other areas of this bill. We have made some significant progress, and no one doubts the chairman's commitment to improving our national parks, and I have appreciated the fact that he goes out and he looks at the parks. I think the fact that we are keeping these fees to improve the parks is one of the most positive things that we have done with the authorizing committee, and there are a lot of things that are positive.

I do not want to paint an entirely negative picture, but unfortunately the other body keeps insisting on these riders; and some of these riders are things that I understand, being from the West. But unfortunately, they get our bill in trouble; and I wish we could convince, and I want to commend the gentleman on this, that the bill when it left the House did not have these riders. They almost, every single one of these riders was added in the other body, and so somehow I hope that we can do better in the next go round because there will be a next go round in my judgment, and we can come up with a bill that can be signed into law.

I went back and looked at my own record. I have been on this committee, this is my 23rd year on the Subcommittee on the Interior. I have seldom voted against a bill, I have seldom voted against a conference report, and I regret that I have to do it today. But I am convinced that we can do better, that we can make this bill stronger, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) to accomplish this task at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a very valuable member of our subcommittee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for an outstanding job, not just this year, but in previous years, outstanding staff on both sides of the aisle; and I say to my friend, the ranking member who is also an outstanding gentleman, I am reminded today of what Ronald Reagan once said, something like this, I am paraphrasing, that somebody who votes with me 80 percent of the time is not 80 percent my enemy, he is 80 percent my friend, or he is not 20 percent my enemy, he is 80 percent my friend; and I really think that the opposition to this bill is focusing on a few narrow problems that on October 21 we need to get beyond.

It is time to get beyond this October the 21, in this year pass this bill, move it out of here; and I hate to see the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) break his perfect record on supporting this because I think it runs counter to the philosophy of the Committee on Appropriations where we do work in a bipartisan way, we do build consensus, we do work through these conference committees, and my colleagues know the old saying that we say in the House from time to time, that maybe the Democrats are our opponents, but the Senate is the real enemy. That seemed to not have changed regardless of who is in the majority. But that is just reality. At the end of the day the Senate does not do what we want them to do, but we have got to move the process forward. So, please do not hold this bill up.

I want to focus on a couple of things that have not been talked about yet,

and that is the energy piece of this bill, a little over a billion dollars out of \$14 billion in energy research, fossil energy and energy conservation.

Let me just say some people may ask why do we fund these programs. Energy research really was brought about by the oil problems of the 1970s and the need for our country at the national level, the Federal level, to rely on research, basic research from the Federal Government, to pursue alternative energy sources so we are not so dad-blasted dependent on Middle Eastern oil. We have got to fund those programs. We are increasing the funding on those programs.

That is at the heart of this bill. We fund the good guys. We fund the Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Geological Survey; these are the good guys. We are trying to fund these good guys; help us fund these good guys. But we also have to reduce our reliance on Middle Eastern oil for the peace and well-being of our country at large.

We hear a lot about climate change, does it lead to global warming? I do not know what the actual science is. I have great questions about it, but I know this. If we can develop better policies through fossil energy research to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, it cannot do any harm; it can only do good. Why not do it? That is in this bill, strong effort, thought through, good science. We studied it; we developed these priorities. It is in the bill. Do not hold that up. Move fossil energy research forward; we will have cleaner air guaranteed if we fund these programs.

Energy conservation, things like weatherization. We do not want cool air to just leak out of our public housing in this country or warm air just to leak out. We want to come up with smarter ways to build public housing in this country to make sure we reduce the cost for our residents and for our Government to take care of the indigent in our country through weatherization programs.

This research is working. It is basic research fully funded in this bill, the kind of things that we need.

This is a good bill. It went through the process, we had the hearings, we do travel, we hear from everyone, we vent, we work through it. Dad-gummit, it is October 21. Let us pass this bill with bipartisan support like we always have before and move this process forward. It is not time to obstruct or delay unless my colleagues are being excessively partisan, and I am not one that is excessively partisan. I jump back and forth depending on what my guts tell me to do, and it is time for my colleagues who want to play partisan games at the end of the year to do the right thing, move this bill forward, pass the bill.

Congratulations.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), one of my distinguished classmates who is working on umpire reform at this very moment.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the problem with being a Red Sox fan is not unlike being in the minority with this particular Republican in the majority. We just do not have any chance to win. We can, like, script it, as my colleagues know, differently each time to make it interesting; but the outcome is always predetermined, and we lose. So I am quite used to this, given the way in which the umpires stole the American League championship from the Red Sox.

Today, I rise to denounce the assault on America's environmental tradition in this Interior appropriations conference report. I am honored to have helped shape the tradition in a small way by ensuring fair royalties for our oil and gas reserves in a law which I authored in 1981 when I was the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Investigations overseeing the Department of Interior by preventing corporations from robbing the American people of their natural resources.

How then can I accept this bill in which the Republican leadership plays with the Minerals Management Service like a yo-yo? The Minerals Management Service proposes rules valuing our oil and gas reserves. The Republicans respond with riders, restricting the rule. For 4 years this yo-yo has rolled back and forth without resources trapped on the string; and, true to form, an additional 6-month delay has been attached to this conference report.

□ 1745

It is time to end this destructive game. Cut the string and give the American people reasonable compensation for oil and gas from Federal lands.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could say that this was the only threat in the Interior Appropriations conference report, but I cannot even say it is the worst. Extension of grazing permits and an allowance for increased mining waste on Federal lands are just a few of the destructive provisions that remain. They buzz around this bill like gulls in a trash dump. We cannot accept a conference report with any of these provisions. We have a responsibility to our natural resources, to our tradition of environmental stewardship.

As we enter the 21st century, we must not relinquish this responsibility. We must protect our resources and we must start by defeating this Interior conference report on the floor this evening.

I thank the gentleman from Washington State for his national leadership and for his civility and compassion for Red Sox fans.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to extend my great congratulations and thanks to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the chairman of the subcommittee, for the bill that we are about to have. I know it is the best we could do with the Senate that we are dealing with on the other side, and certainly, it is not a perfect bill, of course not. But there have been a great number of mistruths presented in this bill that I would like to straighten out in this few minutes that I have.

Over the debate of the last few weeks we have had the so-called Rahall mill site rider included. Did I support it? No. Let me tell my colleagues why. Because the mistruths that were there need to be corrected.

Current law mandates that mill sites can only be five acres in size, but additional mill sites may be used in order to support an economic ore body. That is current law. The reason being, this limitation forces the mining company to use only the minimal amount of public land needed. However, when an additional 5-acre mill site is required, mining companies must comply with all State and Federal environmental laws.

It is important to note that what many would characterize as "mine waste" is nothing more than dirt and rocks covering the ground that is similar to any jogging path or driveway that we have in America today.

Allow me to share with my colleagues on the left who oppose this bill the current environmental laws that mining companies must comply with every time they seek an additional five-acre mill site.

They must fully comply with the National Environmental Policy Act. This means that all activities on mill sites located on public land must be evaluated in an environmental impact statement before they are allowed by the BLM or the Forest Service to have additional acreage. They must comply with the Federal Surface Management Rules which apply to Federal lands and State mining and reclamation programs, which apply to Federal, State and private lands. These programs typically require a detailed characterization of the dirt and rocks which is called overburden; operating controls to prevent or control generation of any excess waste or overburden; continuous monitoring of overburden placed on sites; containment of any wastes; precautions to maintain stability of waste management structures; containment of any chemicals to prevent releases to the environment; reclamation of mill sites to return land to post-mining productive use.

They must comply with Air Quality standards on Federal, State and private lands. All activities on mill sites are subject to the Federal Clean Air Act; State implementation plans and

State air quality laws, including the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, major source permitting, and new source review; Title V operating permits and regulation of hazardous air pollutants and control of fugitive dust.

Mines must also comply with the Surface Water Quality on Federal, State and private lands. All activities on mill sites are subject to the Federal Clean Water Act. All discharges of pollutants are subject to Federal discharge permits and effluent standards, as well as State water quality controls and numeric stream standards. Most mine standards are subject to a Federal zero discharge standard.

Mines must comply with the Ground Water Quality on Federal, State and private lands. All activities on mill sites must meet stringent ground water protection requirements and standards promulgated by States. Most States impose a no-discharge standard on mill site activities. The absolute minimum level of protection mandated by any State is the drinking water standards from the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act.

All activities on mill sites must obtain a Federal wetlands protection permit before placing fill or waste on a mill site.

At the end of the mine life, all activities on mill site must be closed under State laws to be stable, safe, and to remove the potential to degrade the environment.

Lastly, numerous Federal and State laws require operations on mill sites to report spills or environmental incidents and to remediate immediately. Again, reclamation of mill sites must be done to return the land to post-mining productive land use.

This measure contains the mill site provision, but it was unnecessary because all mines today have to go through a very stringent evaluation and environmental protection for mill sites. It was unnecessary to have this rider in it and certainly, I could not support that mill site, but I think this is the best bill we could get, and I want to thank the chairman for his success in getting it to the floor.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), who has been very concerned about environmental issues and one of our outstanding new Members.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I must speak against this bill, and that is with due respect to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) who I think has been very sincere in his efforts to improve this bill. But one of the things the gentleman said struck me in his comments. He mentioned Central Park, a beautiful place loved by maybe all Americans, at least New Yorkers.

But the problem with this bill, if we give up, if we put up the white flag to the other chamber, it would allow

somebody to go into Central Park if it was owned by the Federal Government and put in a strip mine, a gold mine and put as much as they want over 5, 10, 15 or 20 acres. We should not do that in Central Park and we should not do it in the forestlands of Washington where, in fact, that is going to go on if we accept that.

The problem with this bill is simple. While America wants us to go forward on the environment, this takes step by step backwards. We should go forward on mining reform; we go backward. We should go forward on forest reform; we go backward. We should go forward on oil royalties; we go backward.

My colleagues are right, we did send this bill over to the other chamber, but it came back infested with these antienvironment riders. When we sent it over to the other chamber, it was a puppy; and it came back full of fleas and now those little fleas have got to be removed from this bill.

I want to tell my colleagues why I think Americans are going to be so angry, and I think angry is the right word for it, when they hear about this continued giveaway. It is because if you go on Main Street, nothing will outrage the American people more than the giveaways to special interests, the giveaways that this body has given time after time to special interest legislation and antienvironmental riders. That should stop.

If we do not stand for the environment, we ought to stand for this House, for ourselves, for each other. When we voted 273 to say to the other chamber we will not let you shove this down our throats. We will not let you go backwards on mining reform. I do not want to encourage anyone to put up the white flag to the other chamber on this subject. We ought to stand firm.

Let me just point out, when I say this is an abject retreat on mining reform, it is. I would encourage my colleagues to look at section 337(b), which has some of the cleverest legal writing I have seen. It is a little trick in here that says basically that Congress agrees with the mining industry on their interpretation of existing law, existing law. There is a little time bomb in here that will entirely ruin our efforts.

Now, there is talk about compromise, and I understand compromise in a legislative body. But frankly, compromise in this manner, giving in to these special interests is like the guy who steals \$10 from your pocket and wants to compromise by giving you five back. That is the situation with mining reform.

I am simply saying this: we are going to stand divided, unfortunately, on this. Some are going to stand for going forward on the environment and vote "no;" some are going to stand with going backward on the environment and vote "yes." I am going to stand to

go forward. It does not matter how many more stands as far as I am concerned, but the American people desire and are entitled to move forward when it comes to the environment.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), a valued new member of our subcommittee.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

It is a pleasure to be a part of this committee. It has been my first year in the appropriations process, and I have found it most interesting. I found today most interesting. As I said earlier during the debate on the rule, this bill received overwhelming support from this body, and it should have. A lot of hard work went into it. I have listened here during the discussion when the minority Member spoke of the many improvements in the conference report. That was the term he used. He did not define them, but he listed many improvements. So some things are better. But it has been interesting to listen to the discussion, and I think the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) explained the mining issue well.

I have been dealing with bureaucracies for 25 years at State and now at the Federal Government level, and these are debates going on between bureaucracies and people they regulate. I have been involved forever in trying to bring fairness, because I find government lawyers are not always fair and government bureaucrats are not always fair and they should not be legislating, and they are legislating. What we are trying to do is work out to make sure the appropriate people study these issues and come up with the answers. So let us go through them.

I think the gentleman from Nevada adequately explained the hard rock mining regulation. It provides a one-year moratorium. Now, I am not a mining expert, but I was told when we had the debate on the floor and told by many people who know a lot more about mining than I do that that provision would prevent many of our mines from operating that are good mines. They could not work on that limitation of land with their waste. Impossible regulation to live with. Well, we should deal with that. We should make sure that this lawyer is being fair with the mining industry. It is a vital part of our future.

The oil valuation. There is nobody here who wants oil companies to get government oil cheaper than the market price. I do not know of anybody. I do not think there are members of the government who want to take oil out of the public land for less than the value. I do not. I do not know of other members that do.

But if there is a disagreement in how to come to that price, I think we have

a right to look at and have a GAO study done that will resolve that issue. Why should we not do that? We should be fair.

The grazing issue. Another issue where people have been grazing on this land for years. The BLM is way behind in the backlog, not appropriately dealing with this issue. Are we going to punish those who graze? I do not think we should. We have given the BLM extra money, we have taken a 6 month moratorium waiting, and then they can go ahead and if the people are not appropriately using the land, they can stop their permits. These are not environmental riders that are going to devastate the public land of America. That is just not a fair statement. These are disagreements that have been brought to the table and have been given a very limited time to resolve them. That is good government. And those who want to demagogue and punch oil companies and punch grazers and farmers and shut down mining, that is their tool.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should be fair. We in Congress should set the rules on mining, not some lawyer in a department. And if we do not agree with the valuation of the price, then we should legislate what is how we sell oil. We should resolve those issues and not let bureaucrats arbitrarily do what they feel is appropriate when it is not.

This is a good bill. It is thoughtful; it has been a well-worked out compromise; it is the best we are going to get; and I think we should support it and the President should sign it.

□ 1800

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Appropriations, who has worked very tirelessly on all of these bills.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me start by stipulating that the chairman of the subcommittee is one of the finest Members of this institution. I have had the privilege of serving with him for many years, and I think he has graced this body with dedicated service. I think he is thoughtful. I think he is fair-minded, and I think he is a fine chairman of this subcommittee.

I wish that the bill that he brought to the floor was of the same quality as he is, because there would be no dispute if it were.

Let me simply say that we have heard a number of speeches from our friends on the Republican side of the aisle in which they have feigned surprise at the fact that there is so much opposition to this bill, given the fact that there were so many votes for this bill when it originally passed. I think if we want to understand why that is so, all we have to do is take a look at the motion to instruct conferees which passed this body just a few weeks ago.

This House, by a margin of over 20 votes, I believe, on a bipartisan basis,

asked the conference committee to do a number of things. They asked us to go to the Senate level on funding for the arts. We did not do that in the conference committee. The conference committee made no compromise whatsoever with respect to the arts and brought the bill back still at the House level.

The motion to instruct that was adopted by this House on a bipartisan basis also asked the conferees to strip out all of the anti-environmental riders and, in fact, the conference committee did not. In fact, a number of these riders were not even in the House bill when the House bill passed originally. They were added in the other body.

So, again, this conference report does not measure up to the standards that this House set for it in its motion to instruct conferees, and we set those standards on a bipartisan basis with many people on that side of the aisle voting with us, urging the stripping of those riders.

That motion to instruct also asked them to drop the provision on mining so that mines cannot continue to go beyond the authority given to them under the 1872 law, in ruining the environment around them. Again, the conference did not drop that provision.

So I think we should not be surprised that this House is now going to find many votes opposed to this bill.

We are going to be voting against this bill essentially for three reasons. First of all, because the bill in many respects, with respect to the environmental riders is in worse shape than it was when it left the House originally.

Secondly, it contains a number of the provisions on these riders which the House asked the conference to strip and which the conference committee did not, in fact, carry out.

Thirdly, we feel that the conference report does not sufficiently take account of the opportunities available to us to save precious natural resources by meeting the President's request or something close to it for his Lands Legacy Program. That is all that is involved here. It should not be a surprise. From the beginning, from the get-go, we have known that this bill needed to be improved in order to achieve a large number of bipartisan votes, and under those circumstances, since the House leadership has chosen to bring that bill to us without the improvements that the House itself said it wanted when we first sent the conference committee to conference, we have no choice but to stick by our convictions and oppose the bill at this point.

I hope that after it goes down to the White House and is vetoed, the conference committee will take seriously the instructions of the House and take seriously the requests of the President of the United States. And when they do, with the few reasonable compromises, we can have a bill which will

indeed reflect the same kind of quality that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) has reflected in all of his years service in this House.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his comments, and I would say that always in our dealings maybe we disagreed but he has been honorable about it, and I think that is a great quality in this institution.

Let me just say to the Members that are here and that are out there in TV land that here is an opportunity to enhance the legacy that we leave, as legislators, an opportunity to ensure that our public lands will be better when we leave than they were when we came here; an opportunity to tell the people of America that we care about the experience they will have; that we want to ensure that they are well maintained and that we enhance them wherever possible and that they can enjoy in the future generations the same experience we have had with this legacy.

I saw the smile of the gentleman from Massachusetts who brought up the metaphor of baseball. Being from the Cleveland area, I was not in a position to say a whole lot, but if I had been from New York it would have been a little easier.

In any event, let me just close by saying to everyone, we have an opportunity today, by voting "yes," to hit a home run for America.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Interior Appropriations Conference Report.

There are plenty of reasons to vote against this bill, from its anti-environmental riders to the dramatic cuts in the President's Land Legacy Initiative. But most distressing is that once again, in what has become an annual event, the Appropriations Committee has short-changed the National Endowment for the Arts of much-needed funding.

The NEA suffered a 40% cut in funding in 1996 to \$99.5 million and it has been cut even further to \$98 million the last two years, the lowest appropriation to the NEA since 1977, over 20 years ago. The bill that passed the House in July maintained this level once more. As the nation is experiencing historic levels of prosperity, it is time to increase our commitment to the arts. And it seemed, just a few weeks ago, that we had taken a first step toward renewing this commitment. This House voted to instruct our conferees to accept the Senate's modest \$5 million increase to bring NEA funding to \$103 million. But once again, we have fallen short of our promises. Indeed, our own conferees ignored the wishes of this House and insisted on level funding for the third consecutive year. This is a snub to our colleagues as well as to the arts community.

It is a tiny amount of money that we are talking about. A fraction of one percent of our entire federal budget. But these dollars yield dividends that far outweigh the investment. Throughout its thirty-year history, the National Endowment for the Arts has contributed to the

tremendous growth of professional orchestras, non-profit theaters, dance companies, and opera companies throughout the country. The NEA helps support the non-profit arts industry which generates more than \$36 billion of business annually, 1.3 million full-time jobs, and returns \$3.4 billion in federal taxes every year.

The NEA also supports arts education, which is essential in developing critical thinking skills such as reading, math, and science. It builds important workplace skills such as creative problem solving, allocating resources, team building, and exercising individual responsibility. Arts education programs also help to discover and train the next generation of artists. These programs will all suffer as a result of our shortsightedness.

Let's remember that the NEA has an important impact on the arts throughout the country. The NEA stimulates the growth of local arts agencies and investment in the arts by state and local governments. Before the NEA, only five states had state-funded arts councils. Today, all 50 states do. Many of these local agencies have formed partnerships with local school districts, law enforcement, parks and recreation departments, chambers of commerce, libraries, and neighborhood organizations. Innumerable small towns and cities across America have benefited tremendously from federal investment in the arts.

And the NEA has made special efforts to expand its reach into every community in this nation. The funding increase was to go to ensure that it had the resources to carry out this initiative. So, I hope that none of my colleagues will complain next year that their district received no grants from the NEA because it is their own fault that its reach will be stunted.

Once more, the Republican leadership has worked to restrict the growth of the arts in America. And we cannot rely on private money to make up the shortfall when we withhold funding. In fact, since NEA funding is often matched by private organizations, when we withhold public dollars we stifle efforts to generate private donations.

Mr. Speaker, the NEA is a crucial tool in building a vibrant arts community across the nation. We must do more for our artists and cultural institutions. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose passage of H.R. 2466, the Fiscal Year 2000 Interior Appropriations Conference Report. Passage of this conference report is not only fiscally irresponsible, but it is also environmentally destructive. I urge everyone to oppose this bill.

Again and again, we have seen the majority bring conference reports to the floor that we simply cannot afford to pass if we intend to live within the budget caps. Anyone who is concerned about saving Social Security should vote against this report.

Just as bad, this bill contains virtually all of the anti-environmental riders from both the House and Senate versions of this legislation plus three new and equally harmful riders. For that reason as well I strongly oppose this conference report and will continue to oppose any legislation that weakens environmental laws, and infringes on public health, public lands, and the public treasury. I urge all of my col-

leagues to exercise fiscal and environmental responsibility, and vote 'no' on this conference report.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Department of Interior appropriations conference report, and commend Chairman RALPH REGULA who, despite strict budget restraints and difficult negotiations with the Senate, crafted a good bill. However, I do wish to express my opposition to the many policy initiatives, or so-called riders, that were added by the Senate and included in the report. The legislation overwhelmingly passed by the House on July 15 was far superior to the product returned by us by the Senate.

I am concerned that these riders included in the conference report will delay the implementation of necessary rules and regulations that help protect the environment. Furthermore, I am very concerned that the riders single out certain industries and organizations for special protection which gives them an unfair advantage over others.

My biggest concern, however, is that these initiatives will be paid for by every hardworking taxpayer. We should not ask the American people to pay for the kind of inappropriate, costly measures that have not been properly considered or authorized. Major policy decisions, such as these, should be considered by the appropriate authorizing committee after hearings and debate.

Mr. Speaker, overall, I believe the conference product is a good one. In the future, however, we should resist the temptation to attach inappropriate policy initiatives appropriations bills.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express his great appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee, and to all members of the conference committee for the inclusion of a \$10 million appropriation for the first phase of construction for a replacement Indian Health Service (IHS) hospital located in Winnebago, Nebraska, to serve the Winnebago and Omaha tribes. Of course, the conference committee is already well-aware of the ongoing situation with this hospital. Indeed, last year the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee kept the process going by including funds to complete the design phase of the project for which this member and Native Americans in the three state region are very grateful. Now, construction dollars are needed.

Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget overruled Indian Health Service's FY2000 budget request for the first phase of construction, so there was no request by the Administration. Once the design is completed, it is important to begin funding for the first phase of construction without a delay. If there is a time lapse between completion of design and construction, it is very possible that costs will increase, making this project more expensive. That is why this appropriation action at this time is so critical.

In closing Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to acknowledge and express his most sincere appreciation for the extraordinary assistance that Chairman REGULA, the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, and the Subcommittee

staff have provided thus far on this important project and urges his colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Interior Appropriations Conference Report. Since the Republicans took over the House, they have had the dubious distinction of using this spending bill to make substantive, and often controversial, policy changes. Most often, these decisions were in direct contrast to public interest and sentiment. Thus, it comes as no surprise, that we are on the floor debating mischievous attempts by the Republican majority today to undermine and roll back sound environmental policy originally designed by Congress to protect the land that each and every American rightly owns.

The most egregious example of this is the Majority's attempt to kill the oil valuation rule. Although it rolls back no environmental policy, it is a slap in the face to the American taxpayer and costs them millions of dollars every year. On October 1, 1998, the Department of the Interior attempted to correct the underpayment of \$68 million a year in oil royalties not paid by cash laden oil producers to implement a new rule that would raise the royalty fees on oil and gas pumped from public lands. Specifically, the new sound royalty rate would tie the price of oil to the commodity market instead of murky negotiated deals between producers and buyers.

The effect of this rule was to curtail the practice of using posted prices to determine oil royalties. For two, now three straight appropriations processes, Congress has barred Interior from finalizing this rule in hopes that a compromise could be reached. It seems that the only compromise that can be reached regarding this issue is nothing short of the status quo, or if the oil industry had its way, they could pay the government in crude.

The oil industry has skillfully underpaid the government more than \$3 billion and now they are complaining that the government is cheating them and driving them out of business. These accusations should infuriate everyone in this chamber. In the name of profit, big oil has cheated the American public, Indian tribes and our school children by denying them revenue for programs that rightly should benefit them. Delaying implementation of this rule any longer continues to show how money talks and the public's rights walk in halls of Congress.

The Majority has also engaged in another attempt to weaken what little environmental protections that the 1872 Mining Law affords. The House's willing acceptance of the Senate's Millsite Rider astounds me. This rider, which amends the 1872 Mining Law, is contrary to the Administration's legal interpretation of the law and goes against two overwhelming House votes against this issue.

The Administration's interpretation of the millsite provision was an important step in promoting environmentally sound mining practices that have already cost the taxpayer \$32-\$72 billion in clean up costs. Mining today has wreaked havoc on the environment since the introduction of chemical leach technology that made the mining of low grade ore economically viable. Although this technology turned once profitless mines into profitable ones, it

requires significant tracts of land on which to dump toxic fluid mining waste. The House broadly supported the Administration's decision to reinforce the Millsite provision after years of ignoring, but under Senate pressure, the House caved to their demands and rolled back one of the last environmental protections afforded in the Mining Law.

There are numerous other unpalatable riders tacked onto this legislation including denying millions in funds for the President's Lands Legacy Initiative to purchase privately held land located inside and adjacent to our national parks and forests, extending the moratorium on stronger hard rock mining regulations on mines that already exist on federal lands, the automatic renewal of grazing leases, waiving Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management requirements to conduct wildlife surveys before beginning timber sales on national forests and public lands, numerous directives that diminish Indian programs, prevent the Park Service from restoring natural quiet in the Grand Canyon National Park, the list goes on and on.

In addition to the anti-environmental riders, the House refused to even agree to a modest funding increase for the National Endowment for the Arts. As a Member of the Resources Committee, I know all too well that the beauty of our national parks and public lands are an important part of our national heritage. As Members of Congress, we fight for every dollar that we can get to preserve and protect those public lands in our districts. In the same respect, we cannot afford to not fund the arts. Our nation is just as defined by its lands as by its melting pot of different cultures and ideas put to canvas, carved from stone, or seen on film. Instead, Congress is trying to shift America's cultural foundation to popular political tastes. As representatives of the people, we should take no part in stifling and sterilizing the creative development of our nation. Congress should encourage it—Not thwart such expression.

As we debate the multitude of riders tacked onto this conference report, we cannot forget the overall story this bill tells. This story is about the Republican Majority attempting to dictate important policy decisions through the appropriations process. The line that divides the authorizers from the appropriations is becoming transparent. The Committee process is becoming something of a joke. When a Member has a controversial issue to discuss, he or she does not bring it before the House. He or she sneaks it into a spending bill where it receives little or no Congressional scrutiny. Nothing is gained by this process. It allows the feelings of mistrust and abuse to fester, and forces Members to vote against important legislation. This is not the land of special interests and payoffs. It is the land of every American citizen. As such, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this legislation and work to report a new, clean bill to the President.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 200, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

#### YEAS—225

Aderholt	Graham	Petri
Archer	Granger	Pickering
Armey	Green (WI)	Pickett
Bachus	Greenwood	Pitts
Baker	Gutknecht	Pombo
Ballenger	Hall (TX)	Porter
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Portman
Bartlett	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hayes	Quinn
Bass	Hayworth	Radanovich
Bateman	Hefley	Rahall
Bentsen	Herger	Regula
Bereuter	Hill (IN)	Reynolds
Berkley	Hill (MT)	Riley
Biggert	Hilleary	Rogan
Bilirakis	Hobson	Rogers
Bishop	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Blunt	Houghton	Roukema
Boehert	Hulshof	Royce
Boehner	Hunter	Ryun (KS)
Bonilla	Hutchinson	Salmon
Bono	Hyde	Sandlin
Boucher	Isakson	Saxton
Brady (TX)	Istook	Schaffer
Bryant	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Burr	John	Sessions
Burton	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Buyer	Kaptur	Shaw
Callahan	Kasich	Sherwood
Calvert	King (NY)	Shimkus
Canady	Kingston	Shows
Cannon	Knollenberg	Shuster
Chambliss	Kolbe	Simpson
Chenoweth-Hage	Kuykendall	Sisisky
Coble	LaHood	Skeen
Collins	Lampson	Smith (MI)
Combest	Largent	Smith (TX)
Cook	Latham	Souder
Cooksey	LaTourette	Spence
Cox	Leach	Stearns
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Stenholm
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Strickland
Cunningham	Linder	Stump
Davis (VA)	LoBiondo	Sununu
Deal	Lucas (KY)	Sweeney
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Talent
DeMint	Manzullo	Tancred
Diaz-Balart	Mascara	Tanner
Dickey	McCollum	Tauzin
Doolittle	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Dreier	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McInnis	Terry
Dunn	McIntosh	Thomas
Ehlers	McKeon	Thornberry
Ehrlich	Metcalf	Thune
Emerson	Mica	Tiahrt
English	Miller (FL)	Traficant
Everett	Miller, Gary	Turner
Ewing	Mollohan	Upton
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Vitter
Foley	Morella	Walden
Fossella	Murtha	Walsh
Fowler	Myrick	Wamp
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Watkins
Galleghy	Ney	Watts (OK)
Ganske	Northup	Weldon (FL)
Gekas	Norwood	Weldon (PA)
Gibbons	Nussle	Weller
Gilchrest	Ortiz	Whitfield
Gillmor	Ose	Wicker
Goode	Oxley	Wilson
Goodlatte	Packard	Wise
Goodling	Pease	Wolf
Goss	Peterson (PA)	Young (AK)

#### NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Becerra
Ackerman	Baldwin	Berman
Allen	Barcia	Berry
Andrews	Barr	Bilbray
Baird	Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich

Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Bonior	Hilliard	Olver
Borski	Hinchey	Owens
Boswell	Hinojosa	Pallone
Boyd	Hoefel	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Holden	Pastor
Brown (FL)	Holt	Paul
Brown (OH)	Hooley	Payne
Campbell	Hostettler	Pelosi
Capps	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Capuano	Inslee	Phelps
Cardin	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Carson	Johnson (CT)	Price (NC)
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Rangel
Clay	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Clayton	Kanjorski	Rivers
Clement	Kelly	Rodriguez
Clyburn	Kennedy	Roemer
Coburn	Kildee	Rothman
Condit	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Conyers	Kind (WI)	Rush
Costello	Klecicka	Ryan (WI)
Coyne	Klink	Sabo
Cramer	Kucinich	Sanchez
Crowley	LaFalce	Sanders
Cummings	Lantos	Sanford
Danner	Larson	Sawyer
Davis (FL)	Lazio	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Lee	Scott
DeFazio	Levin	Serrano
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Shays
Delahunt	Lipinski	Sherman
DeLauro	Lofgren	Skelton
Deutsch	Lowey	Slaughter
Dicks	Luther	Smith (NJ)
Dingell	Maloney (CT)	Smith (WA)
Dixon	Maloney (NY)	Snyder
Doggett	Markey	Spratt
Dooley	Martinez	Stabenow
Doyle	Matsui	Stark
Edwards	McDermott	Stupak
Engel	McGovern	Tauscher
Eshoo	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Etheridge	McKinney	Thompson (MS)
Evans	McNulty	Thurman
Farr	Meehan	Tierney
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Toomey
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Forbes	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Ford	Millender-McDonald	Udall (NM)
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Velazquez
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Visclosky
Frost	Mink	Waters
Gejdenson	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Gephardt	Moore	Waxman
Gilman	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Gonzalez	Nadler	Wexler
Gordon	Napolitano	Weygand
Green (TX)	Neal	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Obenstar	Wu
Hall (OH)		Wynn

#### NOT VOTING—8

Camp	Jefferson	Scarborough
Jackson-Lee (TX)	McCarthy (MO)	Vento
	McCarthy (NY)	Young (FL)

□ 1831

Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. NUSSLE, SESSIONS, SANDLIN, and LAMPSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1598

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 1598.